



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

REGARDING:

2015 LANGUAGE NEED AND INTERPRETER USE STUDY

RFP # CLASP LNS2015

PROPOSALS DUE:

OCTOBER 31, 2013 NO LATER THAN 3:00 P.M. PACIFIC TIME

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. Organizational Background

- 1.1.1.** The Judicial Council of California, chaired by the Chief Justice of California, is the chief policy making agency of the California judicial system. The California Constitution directs the Council to improve the administration of justice by surveying judicial business, recommending improvements to the courts, and making recommendations annually to the Governor and the Legislature. The Council also adopts rules for court administration, practice, and procedure, and performs other functions prescribed by law. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the staff agency for the Council and assists both the Council and its chair in performing their duties.
- 1.1.2.** The AOC is located in San Francisco. It is comprised of three divisions, including the Judicial and Court Operations Services Division, which houses the Judicial Council's Court Language Access Support Program (CLASP), formerly known as the Court Interpreter Program (CIP). CLASP oversees the testing, certification and registration process for statewide qualification of court interpreters, as well as other administrative functions such as statewide recruitment to secure coverage for court proceedings requiring interpreter services.
- 1.1.3.** The CLASP staff works to increase access to the courts for non-English speaking persons by improving the quality of interpreting and increasing the number and availability of certified and registered interpreters in the trial courts. CLASP services include interpreter recruitment, certification or registration, education and compliance.
- 1.1.4.** Additional information about CLASP, including the *2010 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study*, may be found at the CLASP website:

<http://www.courts.ca.gov/programs-interpreters.htm>

1.2. Study Background

- 1.2.1.** California's Constitution requires the provision of court interpreters for limited English proficiency defendants and witnesses in criminal proceedings. California law additionally requires court interpreters for limited English proficiency court users in specified family law cases—domestic violence (including elder abuse), paternity, dissolution, legal separation, or nullity where a protective order is sought (and if funding is provided), and juvenile proceedings. Federal law requires the provision of interpreters for the deaf and hard of hearing in all court proceedings, both

criminal and civil, as a disability accommodation.

- 1.2.2.** The need for qualified interpreters in California is pressing, and it is growing with the increasing racial and ethnic diversity of the state’s population. 43.2% of California’s population speaks a language other than English in the home. This includes over 200 languages and dialects. Roughly 20% of Californians speak English less than “very well,” which effectively excludes them from meaningful participation in the judicial process without substantial language assistance. (All data is from the U.S. Census Bureau.)
- 1.2.3.** The *2010 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study*, which is located at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/language-interpreterneed-10.pdf>, reports that “the top 15 languages by days of interpreter service were Spanish (167,744), Vietnamese (6,968), Korean (3,687), Mandarin (3,143), Russian (2,753), Armenian (2,501), Cantonese (2,117), Punjabi (2,083), Persian/Farsi (1,768), Tagalog (1,645), Hmong (1,523), Khmer (Cambodian) (1,191), Laotian (861), Arabic (794), and Japanese (655). These statistics show the overwhelming predominance of Spanish as the most highly-needed language in the California courts, representing almost 84% of the interpreter service days for the 15 top languages.
- 1.2.4.** The Judicial Council has designated for certification American Sign Language (ASL) and 15 spoken languages. Designation signifies that the level of need for interpretation in the courts for a given language is great enough to justify the development of bilingual oral interpreting exams to certify individuals providing interpretation in court proceedings. Current designated spoken languages with Court Interpreter Certification Examinations include Arabic, Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian, Cantonese, Japanese, Khmer (Cambodian), Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Punjabi, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese.
- 1.2.5.** Every five years the Judicial Council is required under Government Code § 68563 to conduct a study of spoken language need and interpreter use in the trial courts. In accordance with § 68563, the Judicial Council is responsible for designating languages to include in the California Court Interpreter Certification Program. Decisions regarding the designation of spoken languages are based on several components of the Language Need and Interpreter Use Study, including: statewide and regional use of interpreters in the trial courts, the language needs of limited English proficiency (LEP) court users, and demographic trends in immigration patterns that influence potential increases or declines in interpreter use.
- 1.2.6.** For the purposes of this study, “interpreter use” will include but not be limited to: spoken language use, proceeding, case type, interpreter status (including employment and certification status), half-day or full-day

assignments, and actual time spent on interpretation activities. Currently, both employee interpreters and contract interpreters are assigned through the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (CIDCS) in the same way – half or full day assignments. “Case types” for this study will include: traffic, infraction, misdemeanor, felony, drug court, delinquency, dependency, specified family law cases— domestic violence (including elder abuse), paternity, dissolution, legal separation, or nullity where a protective order is sought and other civil proceedings, including but are not limited to: unlawful detainer, small claims, or general civil. “Event types” for all case types may include but not be limited to: trials, arraignments, client/attorney interviews, preliminary hearings, and disposition hearings.

1.2.7. To better inform future decisions regarding interpreter use in civil proceedings, the 2015 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study will include data collection of interpreter use in selected civil proceedings.

1.2.8. California’s 58 trial courts are divided into four regions for the state wide delivery of court interpreter services. A map showing the counties contained within each region is provided in Attachment 7. The use of the term “regional” throughout this RFP refers to this specific division of California’s trial courts.

2. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES AND DELIVERABLES

2.1. CLASP seeks a single consultant to conduct a study of language need and interpreter use in the trial courts. The preferred consultant will have staff with experience in quantitative and qualitative research methodologies and trends. Staff with experience in court procedures and interpreter use in court proceedings is desirable but not required. Findings and recommendations from this study will assist in the designation of languages to be included in the California Court Interpreter Certification Program.

2.2. The consultant will be expected to develop qualitative and quantitative data collection protocols to determine the statewide and regional use of spoken language interpreters in California trial court proceedings for case types as enumerated in 1.2.6 (above) during the period 2009 through 2013.

2.3. The consultant must collect statewide data for proceedings required by the California Constitution, which includes the use of spoken language court interpreters in criminal, delinquency, dependency, and specified family law cases— domestic violence proceedings (including elder abuse, paternity, dissolution, legal separation, or nullity where a protective order is sought. Data collection for use of interpreters in civil proceedings must include spoken language interpreter use in sample courts for proceedings such as general civil, unlawful detainer, and small claims proceedings.

- 2.4.** The consultant will be expected to report on interpreter activity within trial court caseloads for all proceedings by state and region, including the following elements:
- 2.4.1. Analysis of spoken language use (by language) statewide and by region, per year;
 - 2.4.2. Analysis of spoken language interpreter use by language, case type, statewide and by region, per year;
 - 2.4.3. Average use of full-day and half-day assignments statewide and by region;
 - 2.4.4. Statewide and regional use of cross-assignments (where an interpreter in one county is used in another county) by language;
 - 2.4.5. Analysis of interpreter use by each interpreter's status, including employee, opt-out independent contractor, or independent contractor status, and certified/registered or provisionally qualified status, statewide and by region, by language, by case type, per year.
- 2.5.** Statewide data will be collected using information captured in CIDCS and other independent data systems used by individual trial courts. Data elements not captured in the various systems may be obtained through other methodologies, including but not limited to: interviews and focus groups with court staff from a sample of courts, a statewide survey, or review of court files.¹ Approximately 70% -80% of the courts use CIDCS but courts that use the greatest number of interpreters do not use CIDCS and will require other methods for extracting or gathering the data. Additionally, CIDCS does not capture data for interpretations occurring in civil proceedings such as general civil, small claims, and unlawful detainers. While court staff or judicial officers may be available to participate in interviews or focus groups, the contractor may not expect or rely on the use of court personnel to actually gather data and/or conduct the study activities.
- 2.6.** In addition to interpreter activity in court proceedings, the consultant will be expected to conduct a number of statewide demographic analyses that will assist the Judicial Council in determining which languages should be designated for inclusion in the California Court Interpreter Certification Program and which languages should be considered for de-designation.

¹ Almost half of the state's service days occur in Los Angeles and Orange county courts, which do not use CIDCS. The 49 courts that use CIDCS do not enter all interpretive assignments or the variables describing them (language, case type, and session type). Additionally, courts vary in their use of what was intended to be standardized codes and coding practices.

2.7. Deliverables

- 2.7.1.** Perform the following tasks and provide the associated Deliverable pertaining to the development of a methodology to determine spoken language need and interpreter use on a regional and statewide basis in California state courts:

Deliverable #1: Contractor to prepare a written report detailing data collection methods and to meet with CLASP staff to discuss proposed data collection protocols for the following: assessment of spoken language interpreter use in court proceedings, including criminal proceedings, delinquency proceedings, dependency proceedings, and specified family law cases— domestic violence proceedings (including elder abuse), paternity, dissolution, legal separation, or nullity where a protective order is sought on a regional and statewide basis, and assessment of the use of spoken language interpreters in other civil proceedings (data collection to be conducted in a limited number of sample courts across regions).

Due date: December 31, 2013

- 2.7.2.** Perform the following tasks and provide the associated Deliverable pertaining to the collection of data on spoken-language interpreter use in criminal proceedings, delinquency proceedings, dependency proceedings, and specified family law proceedings— domestic violence proceedings (including elder abuse), paternity, dissolution, legal separation, or nullity where a protective order is sought.

Deliverable #2: Conduct data collection and provide analysis in a written interim report of spoken language interpreter activity in statewide trial court proceedings for criminal, delinquency, dependency, and specified family law (domestic violence (including elder abuse), paternity, dissolution, legal separation, or nullity where a protective order is sought) case types during the period 2009 – 2013. Data elements shall accomplish the objectives outlined in paragraph 2.4 (above) and include, but not be limited to language use, half-day or full-day assignments, case type, and interpreter status (including employment and certification status); and yearly statewide and regional use of cross-assignments by language, region, and case type.

Due date: April 30, 2014

- 2.7.3.** Perform the following tasks and provide the associated Deliverable pertaining to the collection of data on spoken language interpreter use in other civil proceedings:

Deliverable #3: Interim written report showing findings of spoken

language and interpreter use in civil proceedings based on collected data.

Due date: July 31, 2014

2.7.4. Perform the tasks pertaining to the collection of data and analysis of statewide and regional immigration trends, demographic changes that may influence an increase or decline in language need or interpreter use in California. Upon completion of these tasks, Contractor will provide a Draft Final Report to include but not be limited to:

- i. Final analysis of information collected in Deliverables #2 and #3;
- ii. Review and report on existing research pertaining to statewide and regional immigration trends and demographic changes. Data shall include, but not be limited to population characteristics with regard to country of origin, native language, English proficiency, years lived in the U.S., as well as other factors that may, over the next 5 years, influence an increase or decline in spoken language interpreter use in California state courts;
- iii. Conduct a comparative analysis of immigration trends and demographic changes with the current use of interpreters in trial court proceedings over the period 2009-2013 and make recommendations regarding spoken languages to be included in the California Court Interpreter Certification Program and/or languages that should be considered for de-designation.

Deliverable #4: Draft of final written report including: findings, analysis, and recommendations stemming from deliverables #2 and #3; a comparative analysis of statewide and regional immigration trends, demographic changes that may influence an increase or decrease in interpreter need in California; and recommendations regarding spoken languages to be included in the California Court Interpreter Certification Program and languages to be considered for de-designation. Criteria and rationale for recommendations regarding language designation or de-designation thresholds must also be included.

Due date: August 1, 2014

2.7.5. Deliver and present a Final Report and Recommendations regarding the language need and interpreter use in the California state courts. The comprehensive report shall be prepared with professional quality and appearance, and shall be copy-edited before submission. Professional quality includes appropriate binding and use of 2 to 4 colors as necessary. A final print ready copy, including all graphics shall be submitted electronically with an additional total of 50 hard copies submitted.

Deliverable #5: Provide a print ready electronic version and 50 final printed copies of a comprehensive report, including, but not limited to, methodology, findings, analysis, conclusion, and recommendations. Reports must be of a quality and format acceptable to the AOC and shall include a reference to AOC’s copyright ownership, “© Copyright, 2015, Administrative Office of the Courts, All rights reserved.”

Due date: April 30, 2015

2.8. Estimated Contract Value

The estimated contract value of the proposed contract to be awarded for this RFP for the 2015 Language Need and Interpreter Use Study is in the range of \$250,000 to, and not to exceed, \$314,000. All work delivered under a contract awarded under this RFP will be completed by April 30, 2015.

2.9. Table of Required Meetings

Meeting No.	Purpose and Audience	Location	Dates
1	Meet with key AOC staff to discuss expectations, desired outcomes, and methodology protocols	San Francisco	12/5/13 - 12/15/13
2	Briefing with Court Interpreters Advisory Panel (CIAP) and key AOC staff to get feedback on preliminary data collection and analysis	San Francisco w/ Teleconference	8/1/14 - 8/10/14
3	Present draft results and recommendations to key AOC staff and EOP leadership.	Teleconference	2/15/15- 2/28/15
4	Present final report and recommendations to AOC, Judicial Counsel, and CIAP leadership.	Teleconference	4/30/15

2.10. Progress Reports

The Contractor shall submit monthly progress reports to the Project Lead, describing work performed, work status, issues encountered, remedial actions, and statement of activity anticipated subsequent to reporting period for approval prior to payment of invoices.

2.11. AOC Responsibilities

The AOC Project Manager will be responsible for managing and coordinating all Project activities, including Project plans, timelines, and resources, and escalating issues for resolution to AOC management.

3. TIMELINE FOR THIS RFP

3.1. The following list of key events related to this RFP was developed. All dates are subject to change at the discretion of the AOC.

EVENT	DATE
RFP issued	October 1, 2013
Deadline for questions	October 21, 2013 9:00 am Pacific Time
Questions and answers posted (<i>estimate only</i>)	October 23, 2013
Latest date and time proposal may be submitted	October 31, 2013 3:00 pm Pacific Time
Anticipated interview dates (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 7, 2013 – November 8, 2013
Evaluation of proposals (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 12, 2013 – November 18, 2013
Notice of Intent to Award (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 22, 2013
Negotiations and execution of contract (<i>estimate only</i>)	November 23, 2013 – November 30, 2013
Contract start date (<i>estimate only</i>)	December 1, 2013
Contract end date (<i>estimate only</i>)	April 30, 2015

3.2. The RFP and any addenda that may be issued, including responses to proposers’ requests for clarification or modification, will be made available on the following website:

<http://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm>

3.3. Proposers interested in responding to the solicitation may submit questions by e-mail only on procedural matters related to the RFP or requests for clarification or modification of this solicitation document, including questions regarding the Terms and Conditions in Attachment 2. Refer to paragraph 2 in Attachment 1 of this RFP, entitled “Questions Regarding the RFP.”

4. RFP ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are included as part of this RFP:

ATTACHMENT	DESCRIPTION
Attachment 1:	<u>Administrative Rules Governing RFPs (Non-IT Services)</u> These rules govern this solicitation.
Attachment 2:	<u>Standard Terms and Conditions</u> If selected, the Proposer must sign a Standard Form agreement containing these terms and
Attachment 3:	<u>Proposer’s Acceptance of Terms and Conditions</u> On this form, the Proposer must indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. Note: A material exception to a Minimum Term may render a proposal non-responsive.
Attachment 4:	<u>Conflict of Interest Certification Form</u> On this form, the Proposer must certify that no employees or former employees are contracting with judicial branch entities.
Attachment 5	<u>Darfur Contracting Act Certification</u> On this form, the Proposer must certify that they are not a “scrutinized company” doing business in the African nation of Sudan (of which the Darfur region is a part).
Attachment 6	<u>Payee Data Record Form</u> This form contains information the AOC requires in order to process payments.
Attachment 7	<u>Court Interpreter Region Map</u>
Attachment 8	<u>Pricing Form</u> Proposers must submit pricing on this form.

5. PAYMENT INFORMATION

5.1. Payment Provisions are set forth in Attachment 2, Exhibit C.

6. SUBMISSIONS OF PROPOSALS

6.1. Proposals should provide straightforward, concise information that satisfies the requirements of the “Proposal Contents” section below. Expensive bindings, color displays, and the like are not necessary or desired. Emphasis should be placed on conformity to the RFP’s instructions and requirements, and completeness and clarity of content.

6.2. The Proposer must submit its proposal in two parts, the technical proposal and the

cost proposal.

- 6.2.1.** The Proposer must submit **one (1) original and 5 copies** of the technical proposal. The original must be signed by an authorized representative of the Proposer. The Proposer must write the RFP title and number on the outside of the sealed envelope.
- 6.2.2.** The Proposer must submit **one (1) original and 5 copies** of the cost proposal. The original must be signed by an authorized representative of the Proposer. The original cost proposal (and the copies thereof) must be submitted to the Court in a single sealed envelope, separate from the technical proposal. The Proposer must write the RFP title and number on the outside of the sealed envelope.
- 6.2.3.** The Proposer must submit an electronic version of the entire proposal on CD-ROM. The files contained on the CD-ROM should be in PDF, Word, or Excel formats.
- 6.3.** Proposals must be delivered by the date and time listed on the coversheet of this RFP to:

Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Fiscal Services Office, Business Services Unit
Attn: Nadine McFadden, RFP # CLASP LNS2015
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
- 6.4.** Late proposals will not be accepted.
- 6.5.** Only written proposals will be accepted. Proposals must be sent by registered or certified mail, courier service (e.g. FedEx), or delivered by hand. Proposals may not be transmitted by fax or email.

7. PROPOSAL CONTENTS

- 7.1. Technical Proposal.** The following information must be included in the technical proposal. A proposal lacking any of the following information may be deemed non-responsive.
 - 7.1.1.** Proposer's name, address, telephone and fax numbers, and federal tax identification number. Note that if Proposer is a sole proprietor using his or her social security number, the social security number will be required before finalizing a contract.
 - 7.1.2.** Name, title, address, telephone number, and email address of the

individual who will act as Proposer's designated representative for purposes of this RFP.

- 7.1.3.** For each key staff member: a resume describing the individual's background and experience, as well as the individual's ability and experience in conducting the proposed activities. Resumes should include a description of the individuals' ability and specific experience related to conducting the proposed activities. Resumes of key staff should demonstrate the ability and qualifications in the following areas:
- i. Expertise in quantitative and qualitative data collection, research, analysis, and reporting;
 - ii. Expertise in demographic studies and trend analysis; and
 - iii. Knowledge of trial court operations; analysis of court interpreting, or courtroom proceedings (or transferable experience).
- 7.1.4.** Proposed project and team organization, identifying key personnel, their roles and responsibilities, and their estimated individual time allocation to this project.
- 7.1.5.** Proposed selection and use of subcontractors and/or non-employees, if any. If none, so state.
- 7.1.6.** Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of a minimum of three (3) clients for whom the Proposer has conducted similar services. The AOC may check references listed by Proposer.
- 7.1.7.** A detailed summary of the overall project plan that includes a time line and time estimates for the completion of all work required.
- 7.1.8.** The work plan. The work plan will address all tasks and elements referenced in this RFP. While the first month of the project is devoted to developing methodologies, Proposers must include descriptions of general methods the used to complete the Project, including:
- i. Proposed strategies and methods that will be employed to achieve the project objectives and produce the project deliverables.
 - ii. Proposed data collection methods, and
 - iii. Proposed process for keeping the AOC contact informed of progress in the study.
- 7.1.9.** Acceptance of Terms and Conditions.

- i. On Attachment 3, the Proposer must either indicate acceptance of the Terms and Conditions or clearly identify exceptions to the Terms and Conditions. An “exception” includes any addition, deletion, or other modification.
- ii. If exceptions are identified, the Proposer must also submit a red-lined version of the Terms and Conditions that clearly tracks proposed changes, and a written explanation or rationale for each exception and/or proposed change.
- iii. **IMPORTANT: The provisions marked with an (*) within the Terms and Conditions are minimum contract terms and conditions (“Minimum Terms”). A proposal that takes a material exception (addition, deletion, or other modification) to a Minimum Term will be deemed nonresponsive. The AOC, in its sole discretion, will determine what constitutes a material exception.**

7.1.10. Certifications, attachments, and other requirements. Proposer must include the following completed forms/documents in its proposal:

- i. Attachment 4: Conflict of Interest Certification Form ;
- ii. Attachment 5: Darfur Contracting Act Certification;
- iii. If Proposer is a corporation and the contract will be performed within California, proof that Proposer is in good standing and qualified to conduct business in California. AOC may verify by checking with California’s Office of the Secretary of State;
- iv. Copies of current business licenses, professional certifications, or other credentials; and
- v. Proof of financial solvency or stability (e.g., balance sheets and income statements).

7.1.11. A completed and signed Attachment 6, Payee Data Record

7.2. Cost Proposal. The following information must be included in the cost proposal.

7.2.1. A completed Attachment 8, Pricing Form.

7.2.2. A detailed line item budget showing total cost of the proposed services including hourly rates of key personnel, not to exceed hours and amounts, expenses including travel and lodging,

7.2.3. A full explanation of all budget line items in a narrative entitled “Budget Justification and Assumptions.”

7.2.4. A “not to exceed” total for all work and expenses payable under the contract, if awarded.

NOTE: It is unlawful for any person engaged in business within this state to sell or use any article or product as a “loss leader” as defined in Section 17030 of the Business and Professions Code.

8. OFFER PERIOD

A Proposer's proposal is an irrevocable offer for one hundred twenty (120) days following the proposal due date. In the event a final contract has not been awarded within this period, the AOC reserves the right to negotiate extensions to this period.

9. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

9.1. At the time proposals are opened, each proposal will be checked for the presence or absence of the required proposal contents.

9.2. Proposals will be evaluated based on a 100 point scale using the Evaluation Criteria set forth in the table below. All Evaluation Criteria categories are important. Proposals substantially deficient in any Evaluation Criteria Category may result in the proposal being deemed non-responsive. Award, if made, will be to the highest-scored Proposer and an Intent to Award notice will be posted at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/rfps.htm>.

Evaluation Criteria & Submittal Reference	Maximum Number of Points
Quality of Work Plan Submitted (7.1.1, 7.1.2, 7.1.4, 7.1.5, 7.1.7, 7.1.8)	45
Credentials of Staff (7.1.3)	15
Reasonableness of Cost/Fee Proposal (7.2 – 7.2.4, and Attachment 8)	30
References (7.1.6)	5
Acceptance of Terms and Conditions (7.1.9, 7.1.10, 7.1.11, and Attachment 3)	5

10. INTERVIEWS

The AOC may conduct interviews with Proposers to clarify aspects set forth in their proposals or to assist in finalizing the ranking of top-ranked proposals. The interviews

may be conducted in person or by phone during the dates in the timeline. If conducted in person, interviews will be held at the AOC's office in San Francisco. The AOC will not reimburse Proposers for any costs incurred in traveling to or from the interview location. The AOC will notify eligible Proposers regarding interview arrangements.

11. CONFIDENTIAL OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION

PROPOSALS ARE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE PURSUANT TO APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC CONTRACT CODE AND RULE 10.500 OF THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT. The JBE will not disclose (i) social security numbers, or (ii) balance sheets or income statements submitted by a Proposer that is not a publicly-traded corporation. All other information in proposals will be disclosed in response to applicable public records requests. Such disclosure will be made regardless of whether the proposal (or portions thereof) is marked "confidential," "proprietary," and regardless of any statement in the proposal (a) purporting to limit the JBE's right to disclose information in the proposal, or (b) requiring the JBE to inform or obtain the consent of the Proposer prior to the disclosure of the proposal (or portions thereof). Any proposal that is password protected, or contains portions that are password protected, may be rejected. Proposers are accordingly cautioned not to include confidential, proprietary, or privileged information in proposals.

12. DISABLED VETERAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION GOALS

The AOC has waived the inclusion of DVBE participation in this solicitation.

13. PROTESTS

Any protests will be handled in accordance with Chapter 7 of the Judicial Branch Contract Manual (see www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbcl-manual.pdf). Failure of a Proposer to comply with the protest procedures set forth in that chapter will render a protest inadequate and non-responsive, and will result in rejection of the protest. The deadline for the AOC to receive a solicitation specifications protest is the proposal Due date set forth in Section 4, Timeline For This RFP. Protests should be sent to:

AOC – Business Services
ATTN: Protest Hearing Officer
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Sixth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102